



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,189	04/20/2004	Alessandro DE MATTEIS	AGZP115US	3188
24041	7590	01/18/2006	EXAMINER	
SIMPSON & SIMPSON, PLLC 5555 MAIN STREET WILLIAMSVILLE, NY 14221-5406			DESAI, HEMANT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3721	
DATE MAILED: 01/18/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

88

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/709,189	Applicant(s) DE MATTEIS, ALESSANDRO	
	Examiner Hemant M. Desai	Art Unit 3721	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 09 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☒ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☒ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☒ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 7 would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: _____.
- Claim(s) objected to: _____.
- Claim(s) rejected: _____.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.


REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☒ Other: see attached.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amended subject matter to claim 1 and the specification require further consideration and/or search and they raise the issue of new matter.

Further, the proposed amendment to the Specification is at wrong paragraph number ("0027"). The paragraph number "0027" should be paragraph number "0033".

The proposed drawing is not acceptable. The ~~element~~^{element} (20, folding zone, figs. 4 and 6) has been used in previous drawings to label "bearing", see figs. 4 and 6.


Stephen F. Gerrity
Primary Examiner

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Europe on 5/15/2003. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the EP 03425313.8 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Claim Objections

2. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 5 should depend on claim 1. For examination purposes examiner assumes that the claim 5 is depending on claim 1.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-~~8~~^{2, 4-5 + 6} are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rottmann et al. (5147273).

Rottmann et al. disclose a pair of counter rotating folding rollers (8,9, fig. 1), each of the pair of counter rotating folding rollers comprising at least one substantially cylindrical body and a plurality of folding means (16, 18, 20, 21, fig. 1), wherein the pair of folding rollers interact at a contact line (see fig. 1) to produce a stack of folded sheets downstream from the contact line wherein at least one support spaced from the contact

Art Unit: 3721

line is provided (see fig. 1) for each of the pair of folding rollers, which meets all the claimed limitations. "for use in ...products" (claim 1, lines 1-2) and "in order.....area." (claim 1, lines 8-9) are the recitations in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed which does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations.

Regarding claims 2 and 5, Rottmann et al. disclose that the pair of folding rollers and therefore a roller bearing is inherent to rotate the pair of cylindrical rollers.

Regarding claim 4, Rottmann et al. disclose that each of the pair of counter rotating folding rollers comprises at least a first and a second cylindrical body wherein one end of each of the first and second cylindrical bodies are operatively connected along the cylindrical axes of the first and second cylindrical bodies so that they can rotate integrally.

Allowable Subject Matter

- ^{HB}
1/12/06 5. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP